



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/420,208	10/18/1999	SHANE HERMAN	CSCO-48061	2479

7590 07/07/2003
WAGNER MURABITO & HAO LLP
TWO NORTH MARKET STREET
THIRD FLOOR
SAN JOSE, CA 95113

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHAU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/420,208

Applicant(s)

HERMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Chau Nguyen

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-25 and 27-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-25 and 27-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Amendment A, received on 06/18/2003, has been entered. Claims 1, 3-25, and 27-32 are now presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 13-22, 24-25, 27-30, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallmann, Patent No. 6,094,684. Pallmann and further in view of Blum et al, Patent No. 6,182,141.

4. As to claim 1, Pallmann teaches the invention as claimed, a method for a local computer system to control a remote system over the Internet, comprising the steps of:

initiating a log-in procedure by the local computer system (col. 9, lines 10-65);

verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system (col. 9, lines 10-65);

Art Unit: 2142

accepting a command from an authorized user by the local computer system (col. 9, lines 10-65);

executing the command through a File Transfer Protocol to perform a function on the remote system (col. 9, line 49 – col. 10, line 10);

issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system (col. 8, line 57 – col. 9, line 65);

transmitting the command as HyperText Transfer Protocol over the Internet (col. 8, line 57 – col. 9, line 65);

However, Pallmann does not teach processing the HyperText Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarding the File Transfer Protocol command to the remote system. Blum teaches a request such as an FTP request is encapsulated within HTTP by an encapsulation routine before reaching a proxy server, and the proxy server must then strip the FTP request from the HTTP encapsulation before making a connection over the Internet in native FTP mode (col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 11). Since Blum teaches these limitations in an environment such as a computer system for communicating with a remote server through the Internet which is similar to the system of Pallmann, thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Pallmann and Blum to include processing the HyperText Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarding the File Transfer Protocol command to the remote system in order to provide a number of benefits.

5. As to claim 3, Pallmann and Blum teach the File Transfer Protocol command includes one of the commands for file creation, directory creation, file change, file removal, Unix file mode, user ownership change, group ownership change, and security permission (Pallmann, col. 14, lines 23-40).

6. As to claim 4, Pallmann and Blum teach the step of logging user commands for each session (Pallmann, col. 9, lines 10-65).

7. As to claim 5, Pallmann and Blum teach the step of issuing a single script from the local computer system to command the remote system and to upload data to the remote system (Pallmann, Abstract, col. 9, lines 55-65, and col. 11, lines 1-25).

8. As to claim 6, Pallmann and Blum teach the data uploaded to the remote system is used to update or configure the software running on the remote system (Pallmann, col. 20, lines 47-63).

9. As to claim 7, Pallmann and Blum teach the step of issuing a single script from the local computer system to command the remote system and to download data from the remote system (Pallmann, Abstract and col. 9, lines 55-65).

10. As to claim 8, Pallmann and Blum teach the data downloaded from the remote system comprises a software program (Pallmann, Abstract and col. 27, lines 33-54).

11. As to claim 9, Pallmann and Blum teach the step of issuing command-line interface calls from a web-based graphical user interface (Pallmann, Fig. 13 and Fig. 30).

12. As to claim 11, Pallmann and Blum teach the remote system is comprised of a server computer (Pallmann, col. 10, lines 11-26).

13. As to claim 13, Pallmann and Blum teach the step of managing a plurality of remote systems from a single web-based control point (Pallmann, col. 10, lines 11-26).

14. As to claim 14, Pallmann teaches the step of transmitting both commands and content through a same IP port of the remote system (Pallmann, col. 8, lines 29-49).

15. As to claim 15, Pallmann and Blum teach a server computer comprising:

an IP port which accepts FTP commands from a client computer system (Pallmann, col. 8, lines 29-56);

a processor coupled to the IP port which executes the FTP commands (Pallmann, col. 5, line 47 – col. 6, line 16; col. 6, lines 45-60; and col. 8, lines 29-49) ;

a first memory coupled to the processor which contains a file system (Pallmann, Abstract);

Art Unit: 2142

a first memory coupled to the processor for storing an operating system, wherein a remote user issuing the FTP commands from the client computer can administer the file system (Pallman, col. 44, lines 46-64), and wherein further the FTP commands are derived from Hypertext Transfer Protocol commands that are transmitted over the Internet (Blum, col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 11).

16. As to claim 18, Pallmann and Blum teach a memory coupled to the processor for storing changes made during a session (Pallmann, col. 12, lines 21-33 and col. 19, lines 24-37).

17. As to claim 19, Pallmann and Blum teach wherein the I port accepts a single FTP script from the client computer system which contains an instruction and which also contains content data uploaded to the server computer from the client computer system (Pallmann, col. 19, lines 55-65: machine 102 can be used with FTP clients that support the -s:scriptfile syntax on the command line; col. 44, lines 46-64: the user's internet browser might be invoked by issuing to the operating system an command that executes the browser and opens data; col. 5, line 64 – col. 6, line 16: machine 102 can retrieve and process data 102 from data 108 where data 108 is in a text format, HTML format, image files, audio and video files, and machine 102 also accepts a plug-ins (software program) that might process such files).

Art Unit: 2142

18. Claims 16-17, 20-22, 24-25, 27-30 and 32 and are corresponding system and product claims containing the similar limitations as the methods described in claims 1, 3-9, 11, 13-15, and 18-19; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2142

19. Claims 10, 23, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallmann and Blum as discussed in claims 1, 3-9, 11, 13-22, 24-25, 27-30 and 32 above, and further in view of Bowman-Amuah, Patent No. 6,332,163.

20. As to claim 10, Pallmann and Blum, however, do not teach multiple users on a plurality of client computers access the remote system through a single log in. Bowman-Amuah teaches a system that allows users to access services and resources with a single log in regardless of where the user location is or where the resource location is (col. 64, lines 7-27). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Pallmann and Bowman-Amuah to include multiple users on a plurality of client computers access the remote system through a single login in order to make the system more efficient.

21. Claims 23 and 31 are corresponding system and computer-readable medium claims containing the similar limitations as the method described in claim 10; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

22. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallmann and Blum as discussed in claims 1, 3-9, 11, 13-22, 24-25, 27-30 and 32 above, and further in view of Sridhar et al, Patent No. 6,324,582.

Art Unit: 2142

23. As to claim 12, Pallmann teaches the limitations as discussed above. However, Pallmann does not teach the remote system is a router. Sridhar teaches client and server computers are coupled to the Internet (handled by the Internet Protocol), which is connected by routers that forward packets towards their destinations (col. 1, lines 43-61 and col. 2, lines 27-42). Sridhar also teaches application layer protocols for file transfer, FTP (file transfer protocol), and for web page access, HTTP (hyper-text transfer protocol) for the system (col. 3, lines 5-13). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Pallmann and Sridhar to include routers in a remote in order to make the system more efficient.

Response to Arguments

24. In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that

(A) Prior art does not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet including the step of “issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system; transmitting the command as Hypertext Transfer Protocol over the Internet; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command; and forwarding the File Transfer Protocol to the remote system”

As to point (A), Pallmann discloses issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system (col. 8, line 57 – col. 9, line 65 and col. 44, lines 46-64: if the method access is HTTP, the computer identification could be followed by path and file name information such as a command <http://www.myschool.edu/student/main.html> is acceptable, and so the user's internet browser might be invoked by issuing to the operating system the command that executes the browser and opens the file main.html);

transmitting the command as HyperText Transfer Protocol over the Internet (col. 8, line 57 – col. 9, line 65 and col. 9, lines 46-64: if the method access is HTTP, the computer identification could be followed by path and file name information such as a command <http://www.myschool.edu/student/main.html> is acceptable, and so the user's

Art Unit: 2142

internet browser might be invoked by issuing to the operating system the command that executes the browser and opens the file main.html);

However, Pallmann does not teach processing the HyperText Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarding the File Transfer Protocol command to the remote system. Blum teaches a request such as an FTP request is encapsulated within HTTP by an encapsulation routine before reaching a proxy server, and the proxy server must then strip the FTP request from the HTTP encapsulation before making a connection over the Internet in native FTP mode (col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 11). Since Blum teaches these limitations in an environment such as a computer system for communicating with a remote server through the Internet which is similar to the system of Pallmann, thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Pallmann and Blum to include processing the HyperText Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarding the File Transfer Protocol command to the remote system in order to provide a number of benefits.

25. Applicant's arguments and amendments filed on 06/18/2003 have been fully considered but they are not deemed fully persuasive. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 15, and 25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as explained here below, necessitated by Applicant's substantial amendment to the claims which significantly affected the scope thereof.

Art Unit: 2142

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-4639. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Mark Powell, can be reached at (703) 305-9703.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238 (After Final Communications only)

(703) 746-7239 (Official Communications)

(703) 746-7240 (for Official Status Inquiries, Draft Communications only)

Inquiries of a general nature relating to the general status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Chau Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2142

**MEHMET B. GECKIL
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

